



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/722,664	11/28/2000	Dan Shimizu	723-969	5289

27562 7590 09/02/2003

NIXON & VANDERHYE, P.C.  
1100 N. GLEBE ROAD  
8TH FLOOR  
ARLINGTON, VA 22201

EXAMINER

JONES, SCOTT E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3713

DATE MAILED: 09/02/2003

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/722,664

Applicant(s)

SHIMIZU ET AL.

Examiner

Scott E. Jones

Art Unit

3713

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-12, 14-18 and 21-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-12, 14-18 and 21-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 November 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 17 June 2003 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 12.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on June 17, 2003 in which applicant amends claims 14, 21, 24, 30, 36, and 39, adds new claims 40-47, submits a drawing change for figure 4, and responds to the claim rejections. Claims 2-12, 14-18, and 21-47 are pending.

### ***Drawings***

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description:

- Rasterizer unit "400b" is not shown in Figure 5 as discussed on page 17, line 2 of the specification.
- "DATA line" is not shown in figure 17 as described on page 49, line 11.

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "130" has been used to designate both "parallel bus" in figure 2 and "Graphics Memory Request Arbitration" in figure 4. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Specification***

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

- On page three of amendment, Paper No. 8, lines 4 and 5 of the replacement paragraph, "audio code 122" should be "audio codec 122".

Art Unit: 3713

- On page 15, line 25 of the specification, “main memory 110” should be “main memory 112” as shown in figure 2.
- On page 17, line 2, “transform unit 300b” should be changed to “transform unit 300a” because transform unit 300a performs the “lighting processing” as shown in figure 5.
- On page 8, brief description of the drawings, the description for figure 6 should be changed from “Peripheral controller 162” to “Input/Output Subsystem”.
- On page 34, line 8, “registers 1012” should be changed to “registers 1016”.
- On page 39, line 26, “display controller 162” should be changed to “display controller 164” as shown in figure 4.
- On page 40, line 6, “serial interface 100” should be changed to “serial interface 1000”.
- On page 40, line 14, is “communication RAM 1410” shown in figure 11 the same “communication RAM 1014” shown in figure 8”?
- On page 41, line 7, is “input/output buffers 1414” the same as “input/output buffers 1016” shown in figures 7B and 8?

Correction is required.

6. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

#### *Claim Objections*

7. Claim 30 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the last line of the claim, the examiner believes applicant meant to claim “selectively connecting the controllers to either of the first or second storage devices” rather than, “selectively connecting the controllers to either of the first and second storage devices”. Correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 2-12, 14-18, and 21-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Although the claimed invention is described on pages 18-38 and shown in figures 6-12, it is unclear how the claimed invention ties into the rest of the disclosure, particularly pages 1-17 and figures 1-5. In the specification, Applicant describes the interactive computer graphics system (50) as shown in figure 1. Applicant goes on to further describe system (50) as it pertains to the block diagram in figure 2. Applicant then proceeds to provide a detailed description of the graphics and audio processor (114) (shown in figure 2) and as a block diagram in figure 3. In figure 4 and in the specification, Applicant describes and provides a block diagram as it relates to the 3D graphics processor (154) (shown in figure 3). In figure 5 and the specification, Applicant explains and shows a logical flow diagram of the graphics and audio processor (114) shown in figures 2 and 4. In figure 6 and the specification, Applicant originally discussed an example of peripheral controller (162) (shown in figure 3) which incorporated introducing the claimed subject matter regarding the “interface” between the game controllers and the program executing system. However, in Paper No.’s 8 and 9, Applicant amended Figure 6 to be an example of an “Input/Output Subsystem” and amended the specification to reflect the same. After a review of the figures and a closer reading of the specification it is not clear how the Input/Output Subsystem shown in figure 6 is tied into the system as a whole since the

Art Unit: 3713

Input/Output system is not introduced earlier in the specification nor shown anywhere in any of figures 1-5. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art, after reading the specification and reviewing the figures, would be unable to use or make the invention without undue experimentation.

*Response to Arguments*

10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-12, 14-18, and 21-39 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

*Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott E. Jones whose telephone number is (703) 308-7133. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 A.M. - 5:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teresa Walberg can be reached on (703) 308-1148. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

SEJ  
sej

  
Teresa Walberg  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Group 3700